

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-11, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 2, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention, in that the Examiner cannot determine the scope of the claims. "Evidenced that claims fail(s) to correspond in scope with that which applicant(s) regard as the invention can be found in the reply filed July 15, 2005. In that paper, applicant made statements regarding the cable television and regarding how, at a headend, the cable provider encrypts and then transmits and this statement indicates that the invention is different from what is defined in the claim(s) because the claims do not recite any limitation regarding the cable situation."

According to 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 1, "The specification ... shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention." To that end, the specification describes how the invention is to be used in a cable television system. This is what is being described, in general, in the single paragraph in the Remarks of Applicants' Amendment referred to by the Examiner, which bridged pages 7 and 8.

As described in the specification on page 8, line 22 to page 9, line 4, the system of the subject invention includes a transmission station having a headend 52, and a set-top box 54 which receives a transmission from the transmission station 52.

PHUS018122-AMT-033106

Claims 1-11 are related to the set-top box 54 and claim a system for decrypting encrypted transmissions of at least a first signal and a second signal. Note that in the specification on page 9, lines 2-7, the transmission station 52 transmits a first encrypted signal and a second encrypted signal, while the set-top box 54 (e.g., the receiver of claim 1) receives the first and second encrypted signals.


Applicants consider the subject invention to be not only a system including transmission means and at least one receiving means (corresponding, for example, to the transmission station having a head end and the set-top box), but also the decrypting system (embodied in, for example, the set-top box) as claimed in claims 1-11, 16 and 17, as well as the transmission system (embodied in, for example, the transmission station including the headend) as claimed in claims 12-15 (these claims having been withdrawn due to a restriction requirement imposed by the Examiner).

Applicants urge that there is no requirement that the claims describe the invention with the same specificity as in the detailed description. Rather, Applicants may claim the invention as broadly as desired in view of the prior art.

Applicants believe that the above explanation answers the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 2, rejection of the claims, and respectfully request withdrawal thereof.

Applicants believe that this application, containing claims 1-11, 16 and 17, claims 12-15 having been withdrawn, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by 
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613
Attorney
Tel.: 914-333-9611